DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 214 SP 036 855

AUTHOR Yff, Joost
TITLE State Policies To Promote P-16 Collaboration: A Survey of Professional Development & P-12 Content Standards.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 96
NOTE 13p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC 20036-1186.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Partnerships in Education; Preschool Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *School Districts; *State Departments of Education; State Regulation; *State School District Relationship; *State Standards; Teacher Education Curriculum; Telephone Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *State Policy

ABSTRACT

This document reports on a survey of the 50 states and the District of Columbia on collaboration between schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) and P-12 schools in preservice and continuing professional development; and the alignment of teacher education curriculum with state P-12 content standards. Respondents in 13 states reported having explicit mandates by statute or regulation for collaboration while an additional 19 indicated that collaboration is encouraged but not mandated by the state. Respondents in 16 states reported having mandates for alignment of teacher education curriculum with P-12 content standards, while an additional 16 indicated that the state "encourages" such alignment. The findings suggest: (1) state support does affect activity level and programs in education reform; (2) in some instances, the state's position can have a negative effect; (3) in more states than not, schooling and teacher preparation are perceived as distinct, independent processes, and continuing professional development is not seen as a career-long extension of initial professional training; and (4) the move toward more school-based activity in teacher preparation is not yet supported by a change in the tenure and promotion policies. Based on the survey results, four policy considerations are suggested. (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 398 214

State Policies to Promote P-16 Collaboration

A SURVEY OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT & P-12 CONTENT STANDARDS

BY:

JOOST YFF

JUNE 1996

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Long

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

5836855

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is a national, voluntary association of colleges and universities with undergraduate or graduate programs to prepare professional educators. The Association supports programs in data gathering, equity, leadership development, networking, policy analysis, professional issues, and scholarship.

Support for this paper was provided by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this monograph do not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The AACTE does not endorse or warrant this information. The AACTE is publishing this document to stimulate discussion, study, and experimentation among educators. The authors were encouraged to express their judgment freely. The reader must evaluate this information in light of the unique circumstances of any particular situation and must determine independently the applicability of this information thereto.

Copies of *State Policies to Promote P-16 Collaboration: A Survey of Professional Development & P-12 Content Standards* may be ordered from:

AACTE Publications
One Dupont Circle, Suite 610
Washington, DC 20036-1186
E-mail: nnc@aacte.nche.edu

Single-copy price: $5

Copyright © 1996 by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

International Standard Book Number: 0-89333-143-0

State Policies to Promote P-16 Collaboration

A Survey of Professional Development & P-12 Content Standards

The AACTE Combined Governmental Relations Committee[1] has a continuing interest in how state governments support various important dimensions of preservice teacher education and continuing professional development. Among these are two of particular current interest: (1) collaboration between schools, colleges and departments of education (SCDEs) and P-12 schools in preservice and continuing professional development, and (2) the alignment of teacher education curricula with the P-12 content standards promulgated in many states.

To determine the current situation for these two dimensions, AACTE conducted a survey in May 1996 that interviewed, by telephone, a knowledgeable person in each state. This person was typically a dean or director of education in an AACTE member institution, or, in some cases, a representative of the state department of education. The results are summarized in this paper.

This report does not identify *all* efforts underway around the country that are aimed at developing collaborative arrangements between SCDEs and local education agencies (LEAs) for improved education personnel preparation, and those additional activities designed to align teacher education curricula and P-12 content standards—often in the context of revisions in teacher licensure and certification. A substantial proportion of this work is being done by schools, colleges and non-governmental agencies irrespective of state mandates or encouragement, and is outside the scope of this report.

State Positions on Collaboration

The question asked was whether there are state policies and/or programs specifically intended to stimulate and support collaboration between SCDEs and P-12 schools for the purposes of pre- and inservice teacher education. Responses yielded considerable variation among the states. As summarized in Table 1 (see pp 5-6), respondents in 13 states reported having explicit mandates by statute or regulation, while an additional 19 indicated that collaboration is "encouraged" but not mandated by the state. Further, in some states the availability of federal funds (through such programs as Goals 2000, Eisenhower Professional Development awards and the NSF Statewide Systemic Initiative) were seen as helping to stimulate the development of collaborative arrangements. In those instances where it appears that the only impetus for requiring collaboration is a federal program requirement, the state is not classified here as having a "state mandate." Further, it is not necessarily the case that a state mandate is accompanied by the availability of state funds to carry out that mandate.

[1]The Combined Governmental Relations Committee includes representatives from the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education, the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities, and the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities.

Collaboration as Mandated

Language requiring collaboration appears in state statutes and rules in varying ways. In every instance, this requirement is reported to be cast in the context of one or another education initiative. In **California**, for example, such a requirement has been on the books for several years. As early as 1986, the Comprehensive Teacher Education Institute strategy included partnerships of SCDEs, academic departments, county education offices, and school districts for the purpose of teacher candidate recruitment, teacher education and the retention of beginning teachers. California SB 1882 established a three-dimensional professional development system that included explicit responsibilities for higher education, including promotion of more professional development schools and field-based teacher preparation programs; strengthening collaboration with public schools, and fostering ongoing professional development for inservice teachers. A 1992 law, SB 1422, initiated the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program, which provides state money to school districts for developing mentoring and support systems for first- and second-year teachers and requires involvement of SCDEs.

State statutes in **Florida** require collaboration between SCDEs and LEAs. Many former teacher education centers have developed into professional development centers. According to Statute 231.600, professional development centers exist to foster collaboration and enable school improvement.

In **Indiana**, the establishment of the Indiana Professional Standards Board included a mandate for collaboration. In **Kentucky**, the Kentucky Teacher Internship Program provides first-year teachers with assistance and evalu-

ation by way of an internship team that includes an on-site resource teacher, the school principal and an SCDE faculty member.(State regulation requires 150 hours of field experience prior to student teaching.) In **Maine**, a 1993 state board of education (SBE) solicitation was mounted for SCDEs to redesign teacher certification including a requirement for partnership with local education agencies. Eight such partnerships are now funded, and a report to the SBE is due in late 1996. Legislation is expected in early 1997. In **Maryland**, collaboration is a state mandate after recommendations of a Teacher Education Task Force report of May 1996 was approved and adopted by the SSBE. There is strong emphasis on cooperation in providing professional development experiences, and this requirement is used as a criterion in allocation of state and federal resources. The **Massachusetts** Education Reform Act of 1993 requires SCDEs and LEAs to be engaged in developing core curriculum, curriculum frameworks, and assessment protocols.

In **North Carolina**, the 1978 Quality Assurance Program was established jointly by the University Board of Governors (higher education) and the SBE (public schools), pledging mutual cooperation in teacher education. A 1985 Task Force on Preparation of Teachers developed 39 recommendations for teacher education, including support for school/college partnerships. The recommendations were adopted by the legislature in 1987. In 1990, HB 2335 required SCDEs to give service to schools, with each SCDE establishing a committee on school service.

In **North Dakota,** HB 1046 (1995) requires state education agencies to cooperate in the professional growth of P-12 personnel. State funds for professional development support a network of 10 teacher centers which are sites for professional development. The Department of Public Instruction's Professional Development Model and the State Board for Higher Education strategic plan includes a charge to SCDEs to collaborate in professional development of P-12 teachers.

In **Pennsylvania**, SCDEs must collaborate with public schools when receiving state project funds. In **South Dakota**, the governor and Board of Regents' five priorities include P-12 linkage with universities. This is a mandate, and has been used as a criterion for redirection of funds beginning in fall 1995. A major reform of Tennessee higher education, begun in 1988, has dealt in part with school/college collaboration. The 1996 Master Plan for Tennessee Schools includes linking professional development to school improvement, the state's Teacher Education Policy supports development of professional development schools and improving partnerships between higher education and schools. Collaboration is mandated in connection with both the five-year and the four-year teacher education program. New legislation in **West Virginia**, The Jobs Through Education Act of 1996 (SB 300), requires close relations between higher and P-12 education. Personnel preparation and staff development must align P-12 education with the workplace, and must include higher education institutions. The state department of education will require all teacher education programs to be in compliance. While SB 300 requires schools to collaborate with higher education, The Higher Education Reform Act of 1995 (SB 547) requires higher education to collaborate with schools.

Collaboration as Encouraged

Respondents in 19 states reported state positions that encourage, rather than require, collaboration. In **Alaska**, the new commissioner of education has asked for a three-year commitment from teacher education leaders to revise professional licensure standards. The Professional Certification Task Force requires partnerships between SCDEs and LEAs. The redesign of teacher licensure processes in **Arkansas** is encouraging school/college collaboration. Over the last three years, the **Colorado** Commission on Higher Education has had five policy areas targeted for state funding; one is school/college collaboration. The **Connecticut** State Department of Education encourages partnerships, with some state funding. The **Delaware** Education Research & Development Center, whose director is in the state superintendent's cabinet, is housed at the University of Delaware. Through the center's work, the state supports collaboration between SCDEs and LEAs. **Hawaii's** state school system is inherently collaborative through the High School/University Partnership, which applies to all aspects of education. In **Iowa**, the new Iowa Schools Development Corporation, an autonomous statutory entity, provides funds for education development, which includes some partnership activity. **Kansas** has several programs and policy initiatives intended to stimulate and support collaboration, largely in the distribution of federal funds. State department of education committees in **Michigan** are reported to be structured expressly for school/college collaboration. Although there is no mandate in **New Jersey**, the SBE requires LEAs applying for federal funds to work with a college or university. The **New York** State Education Department and the State Board of Regents encourage collaboration, especially in connecting SCDEs with underachieving schools.

The **Ohio** Department of Education's local improvement plans for 1996 include School/Higher Education Partnership Grants for simultaneous enhancement and strengthening of teacher education programs and local schools. "Ohio's BEST" (Building Excellent Schools for Today and the 21st Century), an initiative of the Ohio Education Improvement Consortium, including schools and colleges, is a statewide alliance that encourages collaboration. The **Oklahoma** State Regents for Higher

TABLE I: State Positions on **Collaboration** between SCDEs and LEAs in Teacher Education and Continuing Professional Development

STATE	COLLABORATION REPORTED AS . . . MANDATED BY STATE	. . . ENCOURAGED BY STATE	. . . STIMULATED BY FEDERAL RESOURCES
Alabama			
Alaska		yes	
Arizona			
Arkansas		yes	yes
California	yes		
Colorado		yes	yes
Connecticut		yes	yes
Delaware		yes	
District of Columbia			
Florida	yes		
Georgia			yes
Hawaii		yes	
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana	yes		
Iowa		yes	
Kansas		yes	yes
Kentucky	yes		
Louisiana			
Maine	yes		
Maryland	yes		
Massachusetts	yes		
Michigan		yes	
Minnesota			yes
Mississippi			
Missouri			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1, continued

State Positions on Collaboration Between SCDEs and LEAs in Teacher Education and Continuing Professional Development

STATE	COLLABORATION REPORTED AS . . . MANDATED BY STATE	. . . ENCOURAGED BY STATE	. . . STIMULATED BY FEDERAL RESOURCES
Montana			
Nebraska			yes
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey		yes	yes
New Mexico			yes
New York		yes	yes
North Carolina	yes		
North Dakota	yes		
Ohio		yes	
Oklahoma		yes	
Oregon		yes	yes
Pennsylvania	yes		
Rhode Island			yes
South Carolina			
South Dakota	yes		
Tennessee	yes		yes
Texas		yes	
Utah		yes	
Vermont			yes
Virginia			
Washington		yes	
West Virginia	yes		
Wisconsin		yes	
Wyoming		yes	

Education's Quality Initiative Grant Program, begun in 1993 with planning grants, supports collaboration in improving clinical experiences. A 1994 progress report recommended that cooperation and communication need to be enhanced between university, education agencies, and private business; that ways should be found to strengthen clinical components of programs; and that teacher education faculty should teach a minimum of 10 hours per year in public schools. In **Oregon**, SCDEs enter into compacts with LEAs that are embedded in school improvement and that drive collaboration. The **Texas** Center for Professional Development and Teaching, started by state action in 1991, is a consortium of SCDEs and LEAs that plan and defend teacher education programs before the state. In **Utah**, the governor's Centennial Schools Program, while formerly mandatory, now encourages school/college collaboration. This is reflected in the Utah Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs. A subcommittee of the **Washington** State Board of Education is developing a proposal for collaboration of schools and colleges on professional development plans for teachers who are in their first years of teaching. State action may occur by August 1996. A **Wisconsin** Task Force on Restructuring Teacher Education and Licensure in Wisconsin has asserted that "the responsibilities for initial and ongoing teacher preparation are shared by institutions of higher education, by the schools and communities in which teachers work, by the Department of Public Instruction, and by all professional organizations with which teachers affiliate. These institutions and organizations should develop optimal ways in which they can collaborate in the career-long education of teachers." In **Wyoming**, 21 school districts are in partnership with the university and the state department of education, a program begun some 10 years ago.

State Positions on Alignment of Teacher Education Curriculum with P-12 Content Standards

The question asked was whether there are state policies and/or programs designed to encourage the application of P-12 content standards in curriculum design for teacher education. As summarized in Table 2 (see next page), respondents in 16 states reported having mandates for such alignment, while an additional 16 indicated that the state "encourages" such alignment.[1]

[1] Many of the collaborative efforts supported under Goals 2000 and other federal programs include attention to both partnerships and standards alignment. The column in Table I regarding federal resources is not repeated in Table II.

Alignment as Mandated

Language requiring the alignment of teacher education programs with P-12 standards were reported as appearing in state statutes and rules in varying ways. In most instances, the requirement is cast in the context of teacher education program approval and/or teacher certification rules. In **Alaska**, for example, there is a strong movement towards standards-based certification of teachers. A June 1996 draft report from the commissioner of education asserts that teacher education must be grounded in communities and must be standards based; teacher education program approval must be related to state standards. The **Arizona** State Board of Education requires that teachers be prepared to teach the Arizona Essential E'ements (being replaced by the Arizona Student Standards). All approved teacher education programs address the standards, directly or indirectly. In **California**, SB 1422 established the Advisory Panel for the Comprehensive Review of Teaching Credential Requirements; its report is due in February 1997. The development of P-12 content standards will reflect the knowledge and skills called for in the state curriculum frameworks, and will impact on teacher preparation in that teachers in training will be expected to know about the frameworks. In **Colorado**, HB 1005, The Education Licensing Act of 1991, requires teachers to tie their certificate renewals to P-12 standards, and licensing standards apply to teacher education program approval, by regulation.

The **Florida** Education Standards Commission is charged with designing teacher preparation content. Begun in 1995, the work will culminate with a report to the commission in late 1996. Educator subject competencies will be based on expected performance of P-12 students. The second phase of this effort will focus on developing teacher competencies for certification based on Florida's Curriculum Frameworks. In **Illinois**, P-12 standards are reflected in state teacher education program reviews; teacher education programs must attend to school standards. **Kentucky's** New Teacher Outcome Standards and Experienced Teacher Outcome Standards are consistent with outcome expectations for P-12 learners. All teacher preparation programs must have their programs revised and submitted for approval by January 1, 1997. In **Nebraska**, teacher education programs must interface with P-12 standards; they are the basis for teacher certification endorsement areas. In 1992, the **Oklahoma** Commission for Teacher Preparation recreated teacher education in The Teacher Preparation Act of 1992 (HB 2246). Guidelines are to be effective in July 1997 for alignment with Priority Academic Student Skills (PASS). The **Oregon** Teaching Standards Practices Commission has mapped alignment of teacher education programs with standards and other reform initiatives. The revised, competency-based licensure system will go to the legislature soon. State funding is tied

TABLE II: State Positions on **Application of P-12 Content Standards** in Curriculum for Teacher Education and Continuing Professional Development

STATE	APPLICATION OF P-12 CONTENT STANDARDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION REPORTED AS . . . MANDATED BY STATE	. . . ENCOURAGED BY STATE
Alabama		
Alaska	yes	
Arizona	yes	
Arkansas		yes
California	yes	
Colorado	yes	
Connecticut		yes
Delaware		yes
District of Columbia		
Florida	yes	
Georgia		
Hawaii		yes
Idaho		yes
Illinois	yes	
Indiana		yes
Iowa		
Kansas		yes
Kentucky	yes	
Louisiana		yes
Maine		yes
Maryland		yes
Massachusetts		yes
Michigan		yes
Minnesota		yes
Mississippi		

APPLICATION OF P-12 CONTENT STANDARDS IN TEACHER EDUCATION REPORTED AS . . .

STATE	. . . MANDATED BY STATE	. . . ENCOURAGED BY STATE
Missouri		yes
Montana		
Nebraska	yes	
Nevada		
New Hampshire		
New Jersey		
New Mexico		
New York		
North Carolina		
North Dakota		
Ohio		
Oklahoma	yes	
Oregon	yes	
Pennsylvania		
Rhode Island		
South Carolina		
South Dakota	yes	
Tennessee	yes	
Texas		yes
Utah	yes	
Vermont	yes	
Virginia		
Washington	yes	
West Virginia	yes	
Wisconsin		yes
Wyoming		

10 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to transforming teacher education to a proficiency-based model. Redrafting of the state licensure standards to conform with state standards in **South Dakota** will be completed and considered by the legislature in late 1996. The **Tennessee** Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) defines knowledge and skills to be covered by teacher education programs. The Teacher Education Policy was adopted in 1988 by the SBE, with revision in 1992 to align with P-12 content standards.

In **Utah**, a core curriculum is mandated for P-12. The Utah Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs require that prospective teachers be knowledgeable about the state core curriculum. In **Vermont,** the SBE adopted new content standards in January 1996; pilots in three SCDEs are underway to incorporate the standards in preservice teacher education. New general teacher competencies, parallelling the content standards, are being submitted to the SBE in August 1996. **Washington's** new program approval standards and the move to performance-based teacher education both encourage and require alignment. A Professional Education Advisory Committee is determining what is needed in the teacher education program to align it with new state learning standards for P-12 students. **West Virginia's** move to grade-level testing with the Stanford testing program has prompted a requirement that teacher education programs must be in alignment within five months. This is explicitly mandated in The Jobs Through Education Act of 1996 (SB 300)

Alignment as Encouraged

Respondents in 16 states reported state positions that encourage, rather than require, alignment. In **Arkansas**, for example, the state department of education fosters cooperatives in which LEAs have teacher teams rewrite local curriculum in accordance with content standards. With no statewide mandate, there is variation across the state. In **Connecticut**, State Department of Education content area staff are leading efforts to develop standards; each content committee includes higher education faculty. Next steps include developing professional development programs. The **Delaware** Professional Standards Council is developing teacher standards that match academic content standards. The **Hawaii** State Commission on Performance Standards completed its report in 1994. The state department of education is developing assessment protocols for students, teachers and administrators. The alignment is assumed, although not formally mandated. **Idaho** began developing curriculum frameworks about three years ago. These are out for public comment, and will become guidelines for further development. **Indiana**'s autonomous Professional Standards Board is revising rules for preparation and licensure. A task force is developing implications for teacher education programs and a framework for program assessment. Piloting of portfolio assessment begins in late 1996; new program assessment piloting in 1997; rules in 1998. The **Kansas** Goals 2000 Educational Improvement Plan and Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation both encourage alignment of P-12 content standards with teacher education curriculum.

In June 1994, **Louisiana**'s Professional Employee Qualifications Development Act dealt with accountability of school personnel. Beginning in August 1994, the Louisiana Teacher Assessment Program was in place. Using Components of Effective Teaching, assessment teams (including experienced teachers, principals and SCDE faculty) were subjected to six-day training in applying the components to assessment. This training has impacted on teacher education programs to align with the components. (As of January 1996, all funding for assessment and assessment team training has been eliminated in favor of a move to "school-based authority.") Learning Results is **Maine's** standards package. An Act to Initiate Education Reform in Maine (SP 701) enacted the system of Learning Results in 1996. The act requires that the system include a plan for professional development. The **Maryland** Higher Education Commission recommends that professional development schools support P-12 reform initiatives. Maryland has developed performance-based standards for students, schools and professional personnel. In **Massachusetts**, curriculum frameworks are to be incorporated in the program approval process within the next year or so. **Michigan's** content standards are now advisory rather than mandatory, but there is mandatory state assessment that does include the standards. In **Minnesota**, the state department of education is developing curriculum packages and providing state funds for training teacher educators about this. There are new state assessments for children being written in **Missouri** under the aegis of the legislature, while the state department of education is encouraging restructuring of teacher education approval; all the work regarding teacher education is being done on a volunteer basis. In **Texas**, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) is tied to both school curriculum and teacher preparation. **Wisconsin's** Restructuring Teacher Education and Licensure in Wisconsin (1995) was accepted as the masterplan for teacher education; it encourages alignment of teacher education programs with P-12 content standards.

Conclusions

State support does affect activity level and programs in educational reform, although it is clear that a substantial amount of work is being done irrespective of state support or encouragement. Ironically, in some instances where a negative or expressly non-supportive position by a state education agency or legislature has been reported, SCDEs

and LEAs are said to have reacted by drawing together in collaborative efforts to reform education and to encourage changes in state policy.

In some instances, the state's position can have a negative effect, such as in one state where the compensation for cooperating teachers has been severely limited, and new "ethics" legislation makes it difficult for SCDEs to contract with P-12 employees. In other instances, efforts to develop statewide curriculum frameworks or teacher assessment programs have suffered from moves to "local control" or "school-based authority," in which school districts are free to develop their own standards if they choose to do so, in the absence of state-level guidelines and with or without reference to SCDEs. In one state, the state board of education—the state's program approval authority—is holding public hearings on a policy to award program approval to any regionally accredited institution, either in- or out-of-state—apparently to counter a perceived "conspiracy" on the part of the state's own SCDEs.

Whether in the context of collaboration or of the application of P-12 content standards to teacher education, the results of this survey suggest that in more states than not, schooling and teacher preparation are perceived as distinct, independent processes, and the continuing professional development of school personnel is not seen as a career-long extension of initial professional training. This perception is at odds with how professional development is viewed in other professions, including medicine, law, physical therapy, dentistry, and social work. There continues to be a need for state lawmakers and regulators to recognize the fact that the preparation and continuing development of school personnel and the schooling of children are all parts of one, interdependent system. In several instances, there is little apparent coordination at the state level, where teacher preparation resides in a state higher education agency while schooling —including continuing professional development of school personnel—is the responsibility of a state education department.

The question arises about how quality education can be assured when a state delegates its constitutional responsibility for education to school districts in the name of deregulation and "local control." Is there a minimal level of enabling statutes and supportive positions that a state must provide? Do state accountability standards attached to school-based management encourage experimentation and change?

This survey's findings suggest that the move toward more school-based activity in teacher preparation is not yet supported by a change in the tenure and promotion policies under which SCDE faculty function. The increasing role of clinical experience in teacher preparation requires that SCDE clinical faculty spend more time in schools, but these same faculty must still respond to the primacy of research productivity over excellence in teaching and service that drives higher education's promotion decisions.

Some Policy Considerations

Extrapolating from the results of this survey suggests the following policy considerations:

- Reductions in federal and state funding for education may jeopardize some of the collaboratives that were initiated in states without mandates or encouragement to do so. State policymakers must consider the loss of these profession-based initiatives as a consequence of budget cuts.

- State policymakers should consider options to adjust education funding processes so that higher education and P-12 schools are not placed in competition with one another for state resources. Partners in the education system should be rewarded for making efficient use of public dollars by setting up and maintaining collaborative arrangements.

- Higher education authorities should review promotion and tenure criteria used by colleges and universities in their states to look for ways to acknowledge faculty research, scholarship, and service in P-12 settings.

- The impact of relatively modest federal investments in school improvement —specifically in building P-16 collaboratives—should be carefully evaluated in each state. The results of these evaluations should be shared with federal decisionmakers.

Collaboration between institutions of higher education and local education agencies has always been fragile, in part because it relies on the willingness and vision of professionals in both venues to venture beyond their respective traditional environments. Going beyond the entrenched routines and daily expectations of the university on the one hand and the school system on the other is involving committed and enthusiastic professionals who are striving to define new expectations and routines for the education system. Partnerships of SCDEs, LEAs, and other community agencies working to improve the education of all children has the potential of greater cost efficiency and effectiveness in education reform.

This phenomenon offers a window of opportunity for state agencies and legislators responsible for education. Resource allocation at the state level must take advantage of the current energy and momentum in education reform. Without significant support at the state level, the ventures into collaboration in professional development may well disappear. Without significant state support, nobody wins.

One Dupont Circle, Suite 610 ▲ Washington, DC 20036-1186
TEL: 202/ 293-2450 ▲ FAX: 202/457-8095
HOMEPAGE: http://www.aacte.org/